

REMARKS

In response to the non-final office action of January 27, 2006, applicants ask that all claims be allowed in view of the amendment to the claims and the following remarks.

Claims 1, 2, 5-22, 24-28 and 30-41 are now pending, of which claims 1, 22, and 27 are independent. Claims 1, 5-10, 22, 24-28, 30-35, and 38-41 have been amended, and claims 3, 4, 23, and 29 have been cancelled. Support for these amendments may be found in the application at, for example, page 16, line 5 to page 18, line 18. No new matter has been introduced.

Rejection of Claims 1-41 under Section 103(a) over MacNaughton in view of Kumar

Claims 1-41 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacNaughton (U.S. Patent No. 5,796,393) in view of Kumar (U.S. Patent No. 6,278,993). The rejection of claims 3, 4, 23, and 29 is rendered moot by the applicants' cancellation of claims 3, 4, 23, and 29. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 5-22, 24-28 and 30-41 because neither MacNaughton, Kumar, nor any combination of the references describes or suggests the subject matter of independent claims 1, 22, and 27, as described more fully below.

For example, neither MacNaughton, Kumar, nor any combination of the references disclose or suggest, at least, automatically initiating, over the same connection between the client system and the host system, one or more additional communication sessions between the client system and the host system, the one or more additional communication sessions being associated with the one or more additional accounts associated with the user, as recited in independent claim 1.

Claim 1 recites a method including establishing a connection between a client system and a host system using a first account of a user, the first account of the user being maintained by the host system. The method also includes determining if one or more additional accounts maintained by the host system are associated with the user. In addition, the method includes initiating a first communication session between the client system and the host system over the connection, the first communication session being associated with the first account of the user, and automatically initiating, over the same connection between the client system and the host

system, one or more additional communication sessions between the client system and the host system, the one or more additional communication sessions being associated with the one or more additional accounts associated with the user based on a determination that one or more additional accounts maintained by the host system are associated with the user. The method also includes, for each of the one or more additional accounts, enabling the transfer of electronic data associated with each of the one or more additional accounts to a designated destination in response to automatically initiating the one or more additional communication sessions between the client system and the host system.

The Office action concedes that MacNaughton does not explicitly show automatically initiating, over the same connection between the client system and the host system, one or more additional communication sessions between the client system and the host system, the one or more additional communication sessions being associated with the one or more additional accounts associated with the user, as recited in claim 1. See Office action of January 27, 2006 at page 2, line 23 to page 3, line 2. For this teaching, the Office action relies on Kumar. See Office action of January 27, 2006 at page 3, lines 3-10. However, the applied portion of Kumar does not disclose or suggest this teaching.

Rather, the applied portion of Kumar discloses an Internet portal system that provides access to resources available across the Internet. See Kumar at col. 12, lines 9-11 and col. 5, line 56 to col. 6, line 22. The portal includes portal software, the main purpose of which is to present a list of a user's favorite web sites in the form of hyperlinks. See Kumar at col. 12, lines 19-22. When the user manually selects a hyperlink from the list that corresponds to a web site that requires a log-in (e.g., user name and password), the portal software navigates to the web site corresponding to the selected hyperlink, accesses the user's necessary authentication information from a database of the user's authentication information, and transparently performs the log-in function so the user does not have to manually enter his/her authentication information. See Kumar at col. 12, lines 22-26 and col. 9, lines 9-21.

Therefore, Kumar discloses a single communication session between an Internet-capable appliance and an Internet portal system during which the Internet portal system may perform a transparent log-in function for one or more web sites accessible from the Internet portal. See

Kumar col. 6, line 64 to col. 7, line 4. Kumar does not disclose or suggest additional communication sessions between the client system and the host system, as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, because Kumar does not disclose or suggest additional communication sessions between the client system and the host system, Kumar necessarily cannot, and does not, disclose or suggest automatically initiating additional communication sessions between the client system and the host system.

Similarly, due to the fact that Kumar does not disclose or suggest additional communication sessions between the client system and the host system, Kumar cannot, and does not, disclose or suggest additional communication sessions that are associated with one or more additional accounts associated with the user.

In response to applicants' position that neither MacNaughton, Kumar, nor any combination of the references describes or suggests the subject matter of independent claim 1, the Office action argues that Kumar discloses one or more additional accounts associated with the user that are maintained by the host system. See Office action of January 27, 2006 at page 13, lines 7-16. In particular, the Office action states

Kumar discloses, "in Fig. 8, ISP 145 is provided within PSTN 143 and is adapted to perform Internet-access services as known in the art. ISP 145 comprises a modem bank 171, represented herein by a single modem icon, and an Internet connection server 169 adapted to connect subscribers to Internet 141. Connection server 169 is illustrated as having connection to Internet backbone 157 by an Internet access line 167. Access line 167 may be any suitable connection means known in the art for maintaining connectivity for a plurality of users accessing Internet 141 through server 169 (col. 21, lines 1-10)".

Office action of January 27, 2006 at page 13, lines 9-16 (emphasis in original). However, the cited portion of Kumar fails to disclose or suggest one or more additional accounts associated with the user that are maintained by the host system. Rather, the cited portion teaches a public-switched-telephony network (PSTN) 143 and an ISP 145 that allow users to access resources on the Internet 141. Notably, as taught by Kumar, neither the PSTN 143 nor the ISP 145 maintain any Internet resources, let alone user accounts.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons and the reasons noted in the applicants' previous replies, Kumar does not describe or suggest automatically initiating, over the same connection between the client system and the host system, one or more additional communication sessions

between the client system and the host system, the one or more additional communication sessions being associated with the one or more additional accounts associated with the user, as recited in independent claim 1.

Thus, Kumar fails to remedy MacNaughton's failure to disclose automatically initiating, over the same connection between the client system and the host system, one or more additional communication sessions between the client system and the host system, the one or more additional communication sessions being associated with the one or more additional accounts associated with the user, as recited in independent claim 1. Applicants therefore submit that the references do not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims 2, 5-21, 28, and 30-41.

Claims 22 and 27 recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, and do so in the context of a computer program product (claim 22) and an apparatus (claim 27). Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 22 and 27, as well as claims 24-26, which depend from claim 22.

Rejection of Claims 1-41 under Section 102(e), or, alternatively, Section 103(a), over Mellmer

Claims 1-41 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Mellmer (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0044423). The rejection of claims 3, 4, 23, and 29 is rendered moot by the applicants' cancellation of claims 3, 4, 23, and 29. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 5-22, 24-28 and 30-41 because Mellmer does not disclose or suggest the subject matter of independent claims 1, 22, and 27, as described more fully below.

For example, Mellmer does not disclose or suggest, at least, automatically initiating, over the same connection between the client system and the host system, one or more additional communication sessions between the client system and the host system, the one or more

additional communication sessions being associated with the one or more additional accounts associated with the user, as recited in independent claim 1.

The applied portion of Mellmer discloses an architecture for managing identity information in a network that is capable of providing a transparent log-in when a user manually navigates to a World Wide Web site that requires an authenticated log-in. See Mellmer at Abstract, ¶ 0021, and ¶¶ 0204-0207. In particular, Mellmer teaches a client computer that can access web pages through a web server. See Mellmer at ¶¶ 0102-0103. In addition to serving up web pages, the web server is capable of accessing identity data stored on an identity server. See id. As such, when a user requests the web server to serve up a web page that requires a log-in, the web server can access the user's authentication information on the identity server and transparently perform the log-in.

Therefore, Mellmer does not disclose or suggest, in the applied sections or anywhere else, additional communication sessions between the client system and the host system, as recited in claim 1. Rather, Mellmer describes a single communication session between a client computer and a web server during which the web server may perform a transparent log-in function for one or more web sites accessible through the web server. Furthermore, because Mellmer does not disclose or suggest additional communication sessions between the client system and the host system, Mellmer necessarily cannot, and does not, disclose or suggest automatically initiating additional communication sessions between the client system and the host system. Similarly, due to the fact that Mellmer does not disclose or suggest additional communication sessions between the client system and the host system, Mellmer cannot, and does not, disclose or suggest additional communication sessions that are associated with one or more additional accounts associated with the user.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Mellmer does not describe or suggest automatically initiating, over the same connection between the client system and the host system, one or more additional communication sessions between the client system and the host system, the one or more additional communication sessions being associated with the one or more additional accounts associated with the user, as recited in independent claim 1.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims 2, 5-21, 28, and 30-41.

Claims 22 and 27 recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, and do so in the context of a computer program product (claim 22) and an apparatus (claim 27). Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 22 and 27, as well as claims 24-26, which depend from claim 22.

Rejection of Claims 1-41 under Section 102(e), or, alternatively, Section 103(a), over Pennell

Claims 1-41 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Pennell (U.S. Patent No.6,874,023). The rejection of claims 3, 4, 23, and 29 is rendered moot by the applicants' cancellation of claims 3, 4, 23, and 29. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 5-22, 24-28 and 30-41 because Pennell does not disclose or suggest the subject matter of independent claims 1, 22, and 27, as described more fully below.

The applied portion of Pennell discloses an electronic mail (email) management system including a central email center capable of aggregating, at a single site, email messages sent to different email addresses of the user. See Pennell at Abstract and col. 3, lines 53-65. As a result, the user is spared having to visit multiple sites in order to access all of the email messages. See Pennell at col. 3, lines 59-61.

However, Pennell does not disclose or suggest, in the applied portion or anywhere else, additional communication sessions between the client system and the host system, as recited in claim 1. Rather, Pennell describes a single communication session between a client and a central email center that aggregates email messages sent to different email addresses. Furthermore, because Pennell does not disclose or suggest additional communication sessions between the client system and the host system, Pennell necessarily cannot, and does not, disclose or suggest automatically initiating additional communication sessions between the client system and the host system. Similarly, due to the fact that Pennell does not disclose or suggest additional communication sessions between the client system and the host system, Pennell cannot, and does

not, disclose or suggest additional communication sessions that are associated with one or more additional accounts associated with the user.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Pennell does not describe or suggest automatically initiating, over the same connection between the client system and the host system, one or more additional communication sessions between the client system and the host system, the one or more additional communication sessions being associated with the one or more additional accounts associated with the user, as recited in independent claim 1.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims 2, 5-21, 28, and 30-41.

Claims 22 and 27 recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, and do so in the context of a computer program product (claim 22) and an apparatus (claim 27). Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 22 and 27, as well as claims 24-26, which depend from claim 22.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance.

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.136, applicant hereby petitions that the period for response to the action dated January 27, 2006, be extended for one month to and including May 30, 2006. The fee in the amount of \$120 for the Petition for Extension of Time is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Applicant : Zhaoxi Bu et al.
Serial No. : 09/842,025
Filed : April 26, 2001
Page : 17 of 17

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-083001 /
Communications 14

Respectfully submitted,



Andrew T. Foy
Reg. No. 57,333

Date: May 30, 2006

Customer No.: 26171
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W., 11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40347286.doc